

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 46 and 49 to 52 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 30, and 49 to 52 are independent. Favorable reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3, 5, 7 to 10, 30, 32, 34, 36, 37, 47 and 48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,560,656 (O'Sullivan); claims 2, 4, 11 to 17, 27 to 29, 31, 33 and 38 to 41 were rejected under §103 over O'Sullivan in view of art alleged to be well-known; claims 6 and 35 were rejected under §103 over O'Sullivan in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,586,254 (Kondo); claims 18 to 20, 24 to 26, 42 and 43 were rejected under §103 over O'Sullivan in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,415,023 (Iggulden); and claims 21 to 23 and 44 to 46 were rejected under §103 over O'Sullivan in view of Iggulden and art alleged to be well-known. As shown above, Applicants have amended the claims to define the invention more clearly. In view of these clarifications, withdrawal of the art rejections is respectfully requested.

Amended independent claim 1 defines a method performed by a device to register the device with a remote computer. The method comprises storing an address of a remote computer, where the address comprises a known address that is predetermined and that is not obtained via a discovery process, detecting feature information associated with the device, where the feature information comprising device-specific information, and registering the device with the remote computer by transmitting the feature information to the remote computer at a known address using a self-describing computer language.

The applied art is not understood to disclose or to suggest the foregoing features of claim 1. In particular, the art is not understood to disclose or to suggest storing an address of a remote

computer, where the address comprises a known address that is predetermined and that is not obtained via a discovery process, and registering the device using the known address.

In this regard, O'Sullivan describes what happens when a device joins a network. Upon joining the network, in O'Sullivan, the device conducts a discovery process. In this discovery process, the device broadcasts, over a network, a packet that contains a code for use in communicating with the device. A discovery server 314 receives the broadcast and passes a reference to a lookup service 312 to the device, which enables the device to register itself with a Djinn (see, e.g., column 6, lines 47 et seq. of O'Sullivan). In response, the device registers its services with the lookup service and also registers information that may be used to communicate with the device (see, e.g., column 6, line 52 and column 8, lines 8 to 12).

Thus, unlike the invention of claim 1, O'Sullivan does not communicate to a known address to register. Rather, O'Sullivan uses a discovery process to locate a lookup service and, thereafter, registers with that service. The invention of claim 1 does not use a discovery process to determine the known address.

In addition to the foregoing, Applicants note that O'Sullivan does not describe transmitting feature information using a self-describing computer language. In this regard, page 3 of the Office Action states that column 6, lines 10 to 25 of O'Sullivan describes transmitting feature information using a self-describing language. The cited portion of O'Sullivan describes the use of JAVA in O'Sullivan's distributed computing environment. JAVA is platform-independent, which means that the same commands and structures can be used on different platforms. JAVA is not self-describing in the context of the subject application, in that self-describing languages, such as XML, can carry different types of information. JAVA is limited to

its native commands and protocols. Thus, contrary to what is said at the top of page 3 of the Office Action, Applicants submit that O'Sullivan does not describe transmitting feature information using a self-describing language.

The remaining art of record has been reviewed and is not understood to disclose or to suggest anything that would remedy the foregoing deficiencies of O'Sullivan vis-à-vis claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is believed to define over the art.

Amended independent claims 30 and 49 are readable medium and apparatus claims, respectively, that roughly correspond to claim 1. These claims are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons noted above with respect to claim 1.

New independent claims 50 to 52 include features that are similar to features of claim 1 and thus believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons noted above.

Each of the dependent claims is also believed to define patentable features of the invention. Each dependent claim partakes of the novelty of its corresponding independent claim and, as such, has not been discussed specifically herein.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicants : James R. Hansen, et al.
Serial No. : 09/716,717
Filed : November 20, 2000
Page : 18

Attorney's Docket No.: 11333-013001

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney can be reached at the address shown below. All telephone calls should be directed to the undersigned at 617-521-7896.

Please apply any fees or credits due in this case, which are not already covered by check, to Deposit Account 06-1050 referencing Attorney Docket No. 11333-013001.

Date: September 30, 2004

Respectfully submitted,



Paul A. Pysher
Reg. No. 40,780

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906